

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Bill Eaton

Serial No.: 10/732,722

Filed: December 10, 2003

Docket No.: 200207091-1

Title: MULTIPLE INTEGRATED CIRCUIT CONTROL

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Final Office Action mailed Aug. 26, 2008. Claims 6, 7, 18, 19, 29, 30, 39, 40, 45, and 46 have been canceled without prejudice as to the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1, 11, 14, 24, 37, and 40 have been amended. Claims 1-5, 8-17, 20-28, 31-28, 41-44, 47, and 48 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 7, 18, and 19 are indicated to allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 29, 39, 40 and 45 are objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the features of claim 6 and has canceled claims 6 and 7.

Applicant has amended claim 11 to include the features of claim 19 and has canceled claims 18 and 19. Applicant has also amended claim 14 for consistency with claim 11.

Applicant has amended claim 24 to include the features of claim 29 and has canceled claims 29 and 30. Applicant has also amended claim 25 for consistency with claim 24.

Applicant has amended claim 37 to include the features of claim 40 and has canceled claims 39 and 40.

Applicant has amended claim 43 to include the features of claim 45 and has canceled claims 45 and 46.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b)(1) or, alternatively, under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b)(2).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-21, 23, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, a failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-21, 23, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner provides no basis for interpreting the features of claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-21, 23, 34, and 35 as suggested in the Final Office Action. None of claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-21, 23, 34, and 35 recite “a configuring operation”, “configuring”, or “configuration” as suggested in the Final Office Action on p. 3. Instead, claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-21, 23, 34, and 35 each recite one or more instances of “configured to”. For example, claim 1 recites “a multiple integrated circuit controller configured to initiate and control data transactions” (Emphasis added.) The Final Office Action fails to establish how the language of claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-21, 23, 34, and 35 provide a basis for interpreting the features of claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-21, 23, 34, and 35 to recite “a configuring operation”, “configuring”, or “configuration”.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-21, 23, 34, and 35 fully comply with the enablement requirement and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-9, 11, 14-21, 23, 34, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim Objections

Claims 7, 19 and 40 are objected to because of the following typographical errors: “an idle clock signal generated by only the multiple integrated circuit control between all of the data transactions”.

Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice as to the subject matter contained therein.

Claim 11, which was amended to include the features of claim 19, has been amended to recite “multiple integrated circuit control” at each instance. Claim 37, which was amended to include the features of claim 40, has also been amended to recite “multiple integrated

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Bill Eaton

Serial No.: 10/732,722

Filed: December 10, 2003

Docket No.: 200207091-1

Title: MULTIPLE INTEGRATED CIRCUIT CONTROL

circuit control” at each instance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15-17, 20 21, 24, 26-28, 30-34, 37-38, 41-44 and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Schutte U.S. Patent no. 6,092,138.

Claims 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte U.S. Patent No. 6,092,138 in view of Kawamoto U.S. Patent No. 6,967,744.

Claims 13, 14, 25 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte U.S. Patent No. 6,092,138 in view of Lattice Semiconductor Corporation, “Differential Signaling” dated May 2001.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte U.S. Patent No. 6,092,138 in view of Baker et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,168,006.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte U.S. Patent No. 6,092,138 in view of Oppendahl, U.S. Patent No. 5,500,861.

Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections are now moot in view of the amendments to claims 1, 11, 24, 37, and 40 to include the allowable subject matter of claims 6, 19, 29, 40, and 45, respectively. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103(a) be withdrawn.

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Bill Eaton

Serial No.: 10/732,722

Filed: December 10, 2003

Docket No.: 200207091-1

Title: MULTIPLE INTEGRATED CIRCUIT CONTROL

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-5, 8-17, 20-28, 31-28, 41-44, 47, and 48 are in form for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-5, 8-17, 20-28, 31-28, 41-44, 47, and 48 is respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner maintains one or more rejections, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b)(2).

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application. Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Nathan R. Rieth at Telephone No. (208) 396-5287, Facsimile No. (208) 396-3958 or Christopher P. Kosh at Telephone No. (512) 241-2403, Facsimile No. (512) 241-2409. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Eaton,

By,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2000
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

/Christopher P. Kosh/

Date: Oct. 22, 2008

CPK:dmd

Christopher P. Kosh
Reg. No. 42,760